

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 10, 2000 LB 1213

money. It's not spending new money that we didn't know that we had. And I think there's a big difference between spending new money or talking about what we're doing and transferring money from an existing account that deals with the same size schools.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bohlke, there are a number of transfers we do every year, when we know there's money that's not needed in particular cash funds. For example, we transferred a considerable amount of money from the securities...excess money from the securities cash fund for General Fund use. It didn't even relate to securities or banks or anything like that. We switched it over to the General Fund because it was excess money that we knew we had. And usually in the process, as I understand it, although I'm relatively new at it, we identify those funds and we transfer money out of it so that we can make available to the floor a certain amount of designated money for competition as among the bills that are put forward. But in this case, money is being transferred without having been previously identified anywhere in the appropriations process...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time. Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Raikes, on the motion to return LB 1213.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. President, members. Senator Bohlke drew a distinction between transferring and spending, which I don't understand. If I remember correctly, the feature of that Hardship Fund was basically that that money would be maintained. Schools would borrow that money to face a hardship, pay interest on the money, and then pay it back. So, as I remember it, and I may be wrong, that was not a pile of money to be spent. That was a sort of a trust fund to deal with school hardships. So I think a correct characterization, as I understand it, is that you would be, in effect, raiding the trust fund and spending the principal. Now, I...again, she argued with spending, but I think that's what's going to happen. The money is going to go out as reorganization incentives. I think this is an attempt to combine two separate decisions into one, and I don't think it's good process to do so. One decision is, if the Hardship Fund is not needed, then the way that should